UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,074	02/06/2007	Manuel Gonzalez	200310853-3	2398
	7590 04/09/201 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
	perty Administration	PACHOL, NICHOLAS C		
3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/09/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM ipa.mail@hp.com laura.m.clark@hp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/571,074	GONZALEZ, MANUEL	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Nicholas C. Pachol	2625	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	n the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	ATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (w for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1	s: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the ith appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th	y Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on wh have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than I may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	n and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ned statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within t	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
AMENDMENTS 3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but pr (a)☑ They raise new issues that would require further consider	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	rm for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) $igotimes$ They present additional claims without canceling a corres	sponding number of finally rejected claims. quire further consideration and/or search. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and
	ee attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
	le if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	Il not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of below or appended.
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>16-35</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffiwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	re or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered cient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	me <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	·
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Displaceure Statement(s) (DTO)	
12.	SB/U8) Paper No(s)
/Twyler L. Haskins/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625	/Nicholas C Pachol/ Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 03/17/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to applicant's argument that Silverbrook's coded data are distinct from applicant's pattern marking, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant alleges that Silverbrook's teaching of coded data in tags is different form applicant's teaching of patterns. The purpose of Silverbrook's coded data as a collection of tags is to track edits in a document by determining the location of the pen, Column 39, lines 59-67. According to applicant's specification the pattern is defined as being markings on a sheet that help determine position on a sheet in relation to the markings. This is the same thing as Silverbrook's coded data. Since there is no clear difference stated in the claim as to the difference between the pattern markings and Silverbrook's coded data. The pattern marking are only claimed as an element on a document other then the content, wherein the specification describes the pattern markings as being able to determine the location on the document. Therefore, the coded data of Silverbrook is the same as applicant's pattern markings.

In regards to applicants argument that "Lapstun is silent on modifying the shape or location of the at least one functional area," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that the functional area of the document is the area in which the document is printed on. Lapstun discusses modifying the area that is printed with the tags in relation to the orientation of the page. By changing the orientation of the page, this is changing the location of the tags. The tags are known in relation to the x and y axis of the paper. By changing the orientation of the page, the dimensions of the x and y axis change. This would be changing the location of where the tags are printed, the functional area. Therefore, Lapstun does teach " modifying the shape or location of the at least one functional area.".

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's arguments filed 03/17/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to applicant's argument that Silverbrook's coded data are distinct from applicant's pattern marking, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant alleges that Silverbrook's teaching of coded data in tags is different form applicant's teaching of patterns. The purpose of Silverbrook's coded data as a collection of tags is to track edits in a document by determining the location of the pen, Column 39, lines 59-67. According to applicant's specification the pattern is defined as being markings on a sheet that help determine position on a sheet in relation to the markings. This is the same thing as Silverbrook's coded data. Since there is no clear difference stated in the claim as to the difference between the pattern markings and Silverbrook's coded data. The pattern marking are only claimed as an element on a document other then the content, wherein the specification describes the pattern markings as being able to determine the location on the document. Therefore, the coded data of Silverbrook is the same as applicant's pattern markings.

In regards to applicants argument that "Lapstun is silent on modifying the shape or location of the at least one functional area," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that the functional area of the document is the area in which the document is printed on. Lapstun discusses modifying the area that is printed with the tags in relation to the orientation of the page. By changing the orientation of the page, this is changing the location of the tags. The tags are known in relation to the x and y axis of the paper. By changing the orientation of the page, the dimensions of the x and y axis change. This would be changing the location of where the tags are printed, the functional area. Therefore, Lapstun does teach "modifying the shape or location of the at least one functional area."